arXiv:1302.4244v1 [math.ST] 18 Feb 2013

Quantile regression in high-dimension with breaking

GABRIELA CIUPERCA *

February 19, 2013

Université de Lyon, Université Lyon 1, CNRS, UMR 5208, Institut Camille Jordan, Bat.
Braconnier, 43, blvd du 11 novembre 1918, F - 69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France,

Abstract

The paper considers a linear regression model in high-dimension with multiple change-points and heavy-tailed errors. Least squares method with LASSO or adaptive LASSO penalty can not be used since the theoretical assumptions do not occur and the estimators are not robust. Then, the quantile model with SCAD or LASSO-type penalty allows in the same time to estimate the parameters on every segment and eliminate the irrelevant variables. The oracle properties are not affect by the change-point estimation. Monte-Carlo simulations shown the performance of the methods.

Keywords: change-points; high-dimension; oracle properties; SCAD; LASSO-type estimators.
AMS 2000 Subject Classifications: 62J07; 62F12.

1 Introduction

In recent years, the change-point models and high-dimension regression have received much attention in the literature, most often in the case of a model with zero mean errors and bounded variance. A L_1 or adaptive L_1 penalty in the context of least squares model can be considered. We obtain then the popular method introduced by Tibshirani(1996) and called LASSO (Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator) method. It is well known than the outliers may cause a large error in a least squares estimator. This can happen especially when the error distribution is not Gaussian and distribution tail is large enough. An alternative method is then the quantile estimation.

Study in this paper was motived by wishes to find the properties of the two estimators, particularly interesting in a change-point model with heavy-tailed errors, the outliers being able to create problems in the detection of the jumps. Hence the ideas to first consider a quantile regression. To be more precisely, if the errors $(\varepsilon_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ of the regression model are such that $I\!P[\varepsilon_i < 0] = \tau$, then

---

* *email: Gabriela.Ciuperca@univ-lyon1.fr*

the τth quantile regression is considered, i.e. the regression parameters are found by minimizing the function $\rho_\tau(\varepsilon) = \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i[\tau 1\!\!1_{\varepsilon_i > 0} - (1-\tau) 1\!\!1_{\varepsilon_i \leq 0}]$. The choice of $\tau = 1/2$ yields the median regression and the L_1-estimator, also known as least absolute deviation (LAD) estimator.

Moreover, when the model has a very large regressor variable number a penalty is necessary to estimate simultaneously the parameters on every segment and to eliminate the irrelevant regressors without crossing every time by a hypothesis test. The SCAD (Smoothly Clipped Absolute Deviation) and LASSO penalties have the advantage of selection and parameter estimation. It was established that these two methods have the oracle properties in a model without change-points: the zero components of the true parameters are estimated (shrunk) as 0 with probability tending to 1 (also called sparsity property) and the nonzero components have an optimal estimation rate (and is asymptotically normal). See Wu and Liu (2009) for the SCAD method τth quantile regression and Xu and Ying (2010) for the LASSO-type method in a median regression, both models without change-points. Recall also for a median regression in high dimension the paper of Wang(2012), where a L_1 penalized least absolute deviation method is considered, when the overall variable number is larger than the observation number.

In a multiple change-point model, the break estimation could affects the estimator properties. This is the main interest of this paper. The difficulty to study a change-point model results first from the dependence of the model of two parameter type: the regression parameters and the change-points. A change-point linear model in high-dimension was also considered by Ciuperca(2013) but under stronger assumptions that the errors have mean zero and bounded variance. An adaptive LASSO estimator was studied. It was proved that it has the oracle properties on each estimated segment. However, when the model contains outliers, the adaptive LASSO estimator not be may robust and moreover, the observation number should be greater than the parameter number to be estimated. In the present work we restrict our attention to the quantile regression in high-dimension with multiple change-points when the classical conditions on the errors do not occur. We also carry out simulations to investigate the properties of the two proposed estimators.

The paper is organized as follows. The model and assumptions are introduced in Section 2. In Section 3, the SCAD estimator in a change-point model is proposed and its asymptotic behavior is studied. Next, LASSO-type estimator is given in Section 4. For both methods, the oracle properties, convergence rate and asymptotic distribution of the estimators are obtained. Section 5 reports some simulations results which illustrate the methods interest. In Section 6 we give the proofs of Theorems. Finally, Section 7 contains some lemmas which are useful to prove the main results.

2 Model and general notations

In this section we introduce the models without and with change-points, general assumptions, notations and also general results.

We consider the linear model without change-points

$$Y_i = \mathbf{X}_i^t \boldsymbol{\phi} + \varepsilon_i, \qquad i = 1, \cdots, n \tag{1}$$

where the response variable Y_i is an univariate random variable, $\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a p-vector of regressors (covariates) and the ε_i is the error. The errors $(\varepsilon_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}$ are independent identically distributed (i.i.d) random variables. The regression parameters are $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, with Γ a compact set and $\boldsymbol{\phi}^0$ true value (unknown) of the parameter $\boldsymbol{\phi}$. Contrary to the classic suppositions for a regression model, we do not impose the condition that the mean of errors ε_i is zero or that their variance is bounded.

All throughout the paper, vector and matrices are written in bold face.

With regard to the errors ε_i and the design $\mathbf{X}_i$, we make the following assumptions:

(A1) Let f be the density of ε_i and F its distribution function. We suppose that $f(0) > 0$, $F(0) = \tau$, $|f(y) - f(0)| \leq c|y|^{1/2}$, for all y in a neighborhood of 0. The quantile τ is a real number in the interval $(0, 1)$.

(A2) $(\mathbf{X}_i)$ is a deterministic sequence, such that $n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{X}_i\mathbf{X}_i^t$ converges, as $n \to \infty$, to a non negative definite matrix;

(A3) $(\mathbf{X}_i)$ uniformly bounded.

These conditions are typical for a quantile regression (see e.g. Koenker, 2005). These assumptions are also classic conditions for a model estimated by LAD method: the first condition is found in Babu(1989) and the last two in Bai(1998).

It is of interest to note that by assumption (A1) we have $I\!\!P[\varepsilon_i < 0] = \tau$, but the expectation $I\!\!E[\varepsilon_i]$ cannot exist. A regression model (1) with the errors (ε_i) satisfying the condition $I\!\!P[\varepsilon_i < 0] = \tau$ is called quantile regression. In order to estimate the unknown regression parameter $\boldsymbol{\phi}$, we consider the function

$$\rho_\tau(r) = r[\tau 1\!\!1_{r>0} - (1-\tau)1\!\!1_{r\leq 0}] \tag{2}$$

and the corresponding estimator

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^{(\tau)} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\phi}\in\Gamma} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\tau(Y_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t\boldsymbol{\phi}). \tag{3}$$

In order to study the quantile regression and the estimator (3), let be the processes

$$\begin{array}{l} G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0) = \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}-\boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i)), \qquad \mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0) = \sum_{i=1}^n G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0), \\ D_i = (1-\tau)1\!\!1_{\varepsilon_i\leq 0} - \tau 1\!\!1_{\varepsilon_i>0}, \qquad W_n = \sum_{i=1}^n D_i\mathbf{X}_i^t, \\ R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0) = G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - D_i\mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}-\boldsymbol{\phi}^0). \end{array} \tag{4}$$

Obviously $I\!\!E[D_i] = 0$. The relation between $\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}$ and $R_i^{(\tau)}$ is

$$\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!\!E[\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] = \sum_{i=1}^n [R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!\!E[R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0)]] + W_n(\boldsymbol{\phi}-\boldsymbol{\phi}^0). \tag{5}$$

For the parameter regression vector $\boldsymbol{\phi}$, we shall use the notation $\boldsymbol{\phi} = (\phi_{,1}, \cdots, \phi_{,p})$.
Throughout the paper, C denotes a positives generic constant not dependent on n which may take different values in different formula or even in different parts of the same formula. For a vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \cdots, v_p)$ let us denote $|\mathbf{v}| = (|v_1|, \cdots, |v_p|)$. On the other hand, $\|\mathbf{v}\|_2$ is the Euclidean norm and $\|\mathbf{v}\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{p} |v_i|$ is the L_1 norm. All vectors are column and $\mathbf{v}^t$ denotes the transposed of $\mathbf{v}$.
For coherence, we try to use the same notations as in the paper of Wu and Liu(2009). By elementary calculations, we obtain, with the probability 1, $|R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)| \leq |\mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)| 1\!\!1_{|\varepsilon_i| \leq |\mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)|}$. This inequality, the definition of $G_i^{(\tau)}$ and the assumption (A3) allow to obtain $\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \leq Cn\|\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2$. Following result proves that for every parameter $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ and for every quantile order τ, the process $G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)$ has positive expectation, indifferently of the design X_i.

Proposition 2.1 *Under assumption (A1), we have, for all* $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \Gamma$, $I\!\!E[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] \geq 0$.

Remark 1 *In Bai(1998), the behavior in a neighborhood of* $\boldsymbol{\phi}^0$ *of the process* $\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)} - I\!\!E[\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}]$ *is obtained in the particular case* $\tau = 1/2$*. By a similar demonstration, we can prove that the result holds in general, for any* $\tau \in (0,1)$*: let be a positive sequence* (c_n) *such that* $c_n \to 0$ *and* $nc_n/\log n \to \infty$*. Under the assumptions (A1)-(A3), there exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that* $\forall \epsilon > 0$, $I\!\!P\left[\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \leq c_n} \left| \frac{1}{nc_n^2} \left[\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!\!E[\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)]\right]\right| \geq \epsilon\right] \leq \exp(-\epsilon^2 nc_n^2 C)$.

The proof sketch of this remark is given at the end of Section 6.
As a consequence of this Remark, for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \left(\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \leq c_n} \left| \frac{1}{nc_n^2} \left(\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!\!E[\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] \right) \right| \right) \leq \epsilon, \qquad a.s.$$

It is well known that the estimator (3) has all nonzero components. For estimations and choosing the regressors simultaneously, penalized methods can be used: SCAD or LASSO-type. These estimation methods become all the more interesting for a model with K change-points

$$Y_i = \mathbf{X}_i^t \boldsymbol{\phi}_1 1\!\!1_{1 \leq i < l_1} + \mathbf{X}_i^t \boldsymbol{\phi}_2 1\!\!1_{l_1 \leq i < l_2} + \cdots + \mathbf{X}_i^t \boldsymbol{\phi}_{K+1} 1\!\!1_{l_K \leq i \leq n} + \varepsilon_i, \qquad i = 1, \cdots, n, \tag{6}$$

where $1\!\!1_{\ldots}$ denotes the indicator function.
The model parameters are the regression parameters $(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\phi}_{K+1})$ and the change-points $(l_1, \cdots, l_K)$.
The true values (unknown) are $(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\phi}_{K+1}^0)$, $(l_1^0, \cdots, l_K^0)$, respectively.
Concern the distance between two consecutive change-points, we impose the assumption
(A4) $l_{r+1} - l_r \geq n^{3/4}$, for all $r = 0, 1, \cdots, K$.

In order to study the properties of the penalized estimators in a model with breaking, we need corresponding results obtained without change-points when $\tau = 1/2$: by Ciuperca(2011b), Xu and Ying(2010) and for a some $\tau \in (0,1)$ by Wu and Liu(2009).

In the next section we investigate theoretical properties of the smoothly clipped absolute deviation (SCAD) method in a change-point model.

3 SCAD estimator

We begin this section by recalling the SCAD estimator for the quantile regression model (1) without change-points, introduced by Fan and Li(2001) and developed later by Wu and Liu(2009)

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^{(\tau,\lambda)} \equiv \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left[\rho_\tau(Y_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t \boldsymbol{\phi}) + \sum_{j=1}^p p_\lambda(|\phi_{,j}|) \right] \right). \tag{7}$$

The penalty $p_\lambda(\phi_{,j})$ is defined by its first derivative

$$p'_\lambda(|\phi_{,j}|) \equiv \lambda \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{|\phi_{,j}|\leq\lambda} + \frac{(a\lambda - |\phi_{,j}|)_+}{(a-1)\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{|\phi_{,j}|>\lambda} \right\}, \qquad \forall j = 1, \cdots, p, \tag{8}$$

with $\lambda > 0$, $a > 2$ deterministic tuning parameters. For real x we use the notation $sgn(x)$ for the sign function $sgn(x) = \frac{x}{|x|}$ when $x \neq 0$ and $sgn(0) = 0$. We also denote $x_+ = \max\{0, x\}$.

In order to study the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}$, introduce the function

$$G_i^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \equiv G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) + [\mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}|) - \mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}^0|)]^t \mathbf{1}_p, \qquad i = 1, \cdots, n,$$

with $\mathbf{1}_p \equiv (1, \cdots, 1)$ a $p \times 1$ vector and $\mathbf{p}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \equiv (p_\lambda(\phi_{,1}), \cdots p_\lambda(\phi_{,p}))$ also $p \times 1$ vector, with $\boldsymbol{\phi} = (\phi_{,1}, \cdots, \phi_{,p})$.

We first give the KKT conditions for the quantile model (1) without change-points.

For the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}$ given by the relation (7), let us consider the index set of the variables selected by the SCAD method

$$\mathcal{A}_n \equiv \left\{ j; \hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)} \neq 0 \right\},$$

with $\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}$ the jth component of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}$.

Proposition 3.1 *For the estimator (7), the KKT conditions are*

for $j \in \mathcal{A}_n : \tau \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} \mathbb{1}_{Y_i < \mathbf{X}_i^t \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}} = n\lambda sgn(\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}) \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{|\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}|\leq\lambda} + \frac{(a\lambda - |\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}|)_+}{(a-1)\lambda} \mathbb{1}_{|\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}|>\lambda} \right\},$

for $j \notin \mathcal{A}_n : \left| \tau \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} \mathbb{1}_{Y_i < \mathbf{X}_i^t \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}} \right| \leq n\lambda.$

For the model (6), in order to study the SCAD estimators of the regression parameters $(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\phi}_{K+1})$, and of the change-points $(l_1, \cdots, l_K)$, let us consider the function

$$S(l_1, \cdots, l_K) \equiv \sum_{r=1}^{K+1} \inf_{(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\phi}_{K+1}) \in \Gamma^{K+1}} \sum_{i=l_{r-1}+1}^{l_r} \left[\rho_\tau(Y_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t \boldsymbol{\phi}_r) + \mathbf{p}_{\lambda;(l_{r-1};l_r)}(|\boldsymbol{\phi}_r|)\mathbf{1}_p \right]. \tag{9}$$

In each interval another penalty $\mathbf{p}_{\lambda;(l_{r-1};l_r)}$ can be considered, with $l_0 = 1$ and $l_{K+1} = n$. For simplicity of notation, we denote the penalty of (9) by $\mathbf{p}_{\lambda;(l_{r-1};l_r)}$ for $S(l_1, \cdots, l_K)$ and by $\mathbf{p}_{\lambda;(l^0_{r-1};l^0_r)}$ for the true parameters, but it is understood that the series λ are in fact $\lambda_{(l_{r-1};l_r)}$, $\lambda_{(l^0_{r-1};l^0_r)}$, respectively. The change-point estimator is

$$(\hat{l}_1^{(\tau,\lambda)}, \cdots, \hat{l}_K^{(\tau,\lambda)}) \equiv \arg\min_{(l_1, \cdots, l_K) \in \mathbb{R}^K} S(l_1, \cdots, l_K), \tag{10}$$

with the function S defined by (9). Between two consecutive change-points l_{r-1} and l_r, the SCAD estimator of the corresponding regression parameter $\boldsymbol{\phi}_r$ is

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(l_{r-1};l_r)} \equiv \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_r} \sum_{i=l_{r-1}+1}^{l_r} \left[\rho_\tau(Y_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t \boldsymbol{\phi}_r) + \mathbf{p}_{\lambda;(l_{r-1};l_r)}(|\boldsymbol{\phi}_r|)\mathbf{1}_p \right] = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_r} \sum_{i=l_{r-1}+1}^{l_r} G_i^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_r; \boldsymbol{\phi}_r^0).$$

The following three theorems state the asymptotic behaviors of the estimators (10) and of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(l_{r-1};l_r)}$. The first result gives the convergence rate of the change-point estimator.

Theorem 3.1 *Under the assumptions (A1)-(A4), with the tuning parameter* (λ_n) *a sequence converging to zero and for a deterministic sequence* (c_n)*, such that* $c_n \to 0$*,* $nc_n / \log n \to \infty$ *and* $\lambda_n c_n^{-2} \to 0$*, as* $n \to \infty$*, we have* $\hat{l}_r^{(\tau,\lambda)} - l_r^0 = O_{I\!P}(1)$*, for every* $r = 1, \cdots, K$*.*

Remark 2 *We have following relations between the sequences* (λ_n) *and* (c_n)*,* $\lambda_n \ll c_n^2 \ll c_n$*. Example of sequence* (c_n)*:* $c_n^2 = \lambda_n \log n$*.*

By the Theorem 1 of Wu and Liu(2009), for tuning sequence $\lambda_{(l_{r-1},l_r)}$ converging to zero as $n \to \infty$, we have that the convergence rate of the estimators of $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ in each segment is of order $(l_r^0 - l_{r-1}^0)^{-1/2}$. Hence, taking into account Theorem 3.1, we deduce that $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(\hat{l}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{r-1};\hat{l}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_r)} - \boldsymbol{\phi}_r^0\|_2 = O_{I\!P}\left(\hat{l}_r^{(\tau,\lambda)} - \hat{l}_{r-1}^{(\tau,\lambda)}\right)^{-1/2}$.

We suppose that for each interval we have that the matrix $(l_r - l_{r-1})^{-1} \sum_{i=l_{r-1}+1}^{l_r} \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^t$ converges to $\mathbf{C}_r$, as $n \to \infty$, with $\mathbf{C}_r$ a non-negative definite matrix, which can be singular. Let us denote by $\mathbf{C}_r^0$ the limiting matrix for the true change-points l_r^0, $r = 1, \cdots, K$. We also denote by $C^0_{r,kj}$ the (k,j)th component of matrix $\mathbf{C}_r^0$.

The following result proves that on every segment, the SCAD estimator for the regression parameters has the oracle properties: nonzero parameters estimator on each estimated segment is asymptotically normal and zero parameters are shrunk directly to 0 with a probability converging to 1. Let us underline that the limiting distribution not depend on the penalty $\mathbf{p}_\lambda$, but only of the quantile order τ.

Theorem 3.2 *Under the assumptions (A1)-A4), if* $\lambda_{(l_{r-1},l_r)} \to 0$, $(l_{r-1} - l_r)^{1/2}\lambda_{(l_{r-1},l_r)} \to \infty$, *as* $n \to \infty$, *we have*
(i) $(\hat{l}_r^{(\tau,\lambda)} - \hat{l}_{r-1}^{(\tau,\lambda)})^{1/2} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(\hat{l}_{r-1}^{(\tau;\lambda)};\hat{l}_r^{(\tau;\lambda)})} - \boldsymbol{\phi}_r^0 \right)_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}_r} = (l_r^0 - l_{r-1}^0)^{1/2} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(\hat{l}_{r-1}^{(\tau;\lambda)};\hat{l}_r^{(\tau;\lambda)})} - \boldsymbol{\phi}_r^0 \right)_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}_r} (1 + o_{I\!P}(1)) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}, \tau(1-\tau)/f^2(0)(\Omega_r^0)^{-1}\right)$, *where* $q_r \equiv Card\{\mathcal{A}_{(l_{r-1}^0,l_r^0)}\}$, $\Omega_r^0 \equiv (C_{r,kj}^0)_{k,j\in\mathcal{A}_{(l_{r-1}^0,l_r^0)}}$ *is a* $q_r \times q_r$ *matrix.*
(ii) $\lim_{n\to\infty} I\!P \left[\mathcal{A}_{n;(l_{r-1}^0,l_r^0)} = \mathcal{A}_{n;(\hat{l}_{r-1}^{(\tau,\lambda)},\hat{l}_r^{(\tau,\lambda)})} = \mathcal{A}_{(l_{r-1}^0,l_r^0)} \right] = 1$, *with:* $\mathcal{A}_{(l_{r-1}^0,l_r^0)} \equiv \left\{ j; \phi_{r,j}^0 \neq 0 \right\}$, $\mathcal{A}_{n;(l_{r-1}^0,l_r^0)} \equiv \left\{ j; \hat{\phi}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(l_{r-1}^0,l_r^0),j} \neq 0 \right\}$ *and* $\mathcal{A}_{n;(\hat{l}_{r-1}^{(\tau,\lambda)},\hat{l}_r^{(\tau,\lambda)})} \equiv \left\{ j; \hat{\phi}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(\hat{l}_{r-1}^{(\tau,\lambda)},\hat{l}_r^{(\tau,\lambda)}),j} \neq 0 \right\} =^{noted} \hat{\mathcal{A}}_r$.

We denoted by $\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\hat{\mathcal{A}}_r}$ the sub-vector of $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ containing the corresponding components of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_r$. Observe also that q_r is the true number of nonzero components in rth segment.
The next theorem establishes the asymptotic distribution of the change-point SCAD estimator. The limit distribution depends on the quantile order τ.

Theorem 3.3 *Under the assumptions (A1)-(A4), with the tuning parameter sequence as in Theorem 3.1 and with the condition* $\lambda_{(l_{r-1}^0,l_r^0)}(l_r^0 - l_{r-1}^0)^{1/2} = o(1)$, *we have that the estimator of the* r*th change-point* $(\hat{l}_r^{(\tau,\lambda)} - l_r^0)$ *has the asymptotic distribution* $\arg\min_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} Z_{r,j}^{(\tau)}$, *with* $Z_{r,0}^{(\tau)} = 0$ *and*
- for $j = 1, 2, \cdots$ *:* $Z_{r,j}^{(\tau)} \equiv \sum_{i=l_r^0+1}^{l_r^0+j} \left[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_r^0 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_{r+1}^0)) - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i) \right]$;
- for $j = -1, -2, \cdots$ *:* $Z_{r,j}^{(\tau)} \equiv \sum_{i=l_r^0+j}^{l_r^0} \left[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i + \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_r^0 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_{r+1}^0)) - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i) \right]$.

It is important to note that, either the condition $(l_{r-1} - l_r)^{1/2}\lambda_{(l_{r-1},l_r)} \to \infty$ are satisfied, thus the oracle properties hold, or $\lambda_{(l_{r-1}^0,l_r^0)}(l_r^0 - l_{r-1}^0)^{1/2} = o(1)$, thus we have the asymptotic distribution of change-point estimator. Cannot both be true simultaneously.

4 LASSO-type estimator

An important theoretical fact is that, as Zou(2006) showed recently, the oracle properties do not hold for the LASSO estimator. We have just seen that considering the SCAD method, the obtained estimators have this property. But the last method is difficult to put into practice with regard to numerical algorithms. Thus, Xu and Ying(2010) proposed, for model (1), that the tunning

parameter λ change from one component to the other of the parameter $\boldsymbol{\phi}$.
In this section the median model ($\tau = 1/2$) is studied.
First, the model (1) without change-points, mentioned in Section 2, is considered. The parameter $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is estimate by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^L = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |Y_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t \boldsymbol{\phi}| + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_n^t |\boldsymbol{\phi}| \right). \tag{11}$$

Compared with the method seen in the previous section, now, the tuning parameter $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n = (\lambda_{n,1}, \cdots, \lambda_{n,p})$ is a random p-vector with different components. The fact that $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n$ has different components, makes possible that the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^L$ have the oracle property, obviously, choosing the components of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n$ in a judicious way.
For the regression model (1) without change-points, and for the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^L$ given by (11), consider the index set of estimator nonzero components $\mathcal{A}_n^L \equiv \{j; \hat{\phi}_{n,j}^L \neq 0\}$ where $\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^L$ the jth component of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^L$. Similar to the Proposition 3.1, we obtain that the KKT relations are in this case:
$-\sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} \cdot sgn(Y_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^L) + \lambda_{n,j} \cdot sgn(\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^L) = 0$, for all $j \in \mathcal{A}_n^L$,
$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} \cdot sgn(Y_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^L) \right| \leq \lambda_{n,j}$, for all $j \notin \mathcal{A}_n^L$,
with $\lambda_{n,j}$ the jth component of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n$ and $\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^L$ of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^L$.
Consider now the change-point problem (6), with K (known) changes. For this estimation method, the change-point estimator is

$$(\hat{l}_1^L, \cdots, \hat{l}_K^L) \equiv \arg\min_{(l_1, \cdots, l_K) \in \mathbb{R}^K} \sum_{r=1}^{K+1} \inf_{(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\phi}_{K+1})} \sum_{i=l_{r-1}+1}^{l_r} \left[|Y_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t \boldsymbol{\phi}_r| + \frac{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{n,(l_{r-1}, l_r)}^t}{l_r - l_{r-1}} |\boldsymbol{\phi}_r| \right].$$

Taking into account that a particular case ($\tau = 1/2$) to the quantile regression is considered, following processes are introduced

$$\begin{array}{ll} G_i^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \equiv |\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)| - |\varepsilon_i|, & i = 1, \cdots, n \\ \eta_{i;(j_1,j_2)}^L(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \equiv G_i^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) + (j_2 - j_1)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{n;(j_1,j_2)}^t (|\boldsymbol{\phi}| - |\boldsymbol{\phi}^0|), & i = j_1 + 1, \cdots, j_2 \end{array} \tag{12}$$

with $0 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n$ and $\boldsymbol{\phi}^0$ the true parameter. In the particular case $j_1 = 0$ and $j_2 = n$, let us denote $\lambda_{n;(0,n)}$ by λ_n.
Observe that, since we will study the model (6) with change-points, by the least absolute deviation method ($\tau = 1/2$) with LASSO-type penalty, the related results obtained when there is no penalty by Bai(1998), Ciuperca(2011b) are needed.

Following result yields that, even if the penalty is different, this estimator has the same convergence rate as the estimator obtained by the SCAD method.

Theorem 4.1 *If the tuning parameter* $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)}$ *satisfies the conditions* $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)}\|_2 \to \infty$, $(l_r - l_{r-1})^{-1/2}\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)}\|_2 \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{I\!\!P} M \geq 0$, *under the assumptions (A1)-(A4), we have* $\hat{l}^L_r - l^0_r = O_{I\!\!P}(1)$, *for every* $r = 1, \cdots, K$.

Combining the Theorem 4.1 and the $\sqrt{n}$-consistency of the parameter estimator in a model without change-points (see Theorem 2 of Xu and Ying, 2010), we have that the convergence rate of the regression parameter LASSO-type estimator on each segment is $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r)} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0_r\|_2 = (l^0_r - l^0_{r-1})^{-1/2} O_{I\!\!P}(1)$.

For this method type, the most important is to verify that if the oracle properties are preserved in a change-point model. The sparsity property is the most interesting and it risk to be influenced by the change-point estimation. We would like to point out that, due to a penalty different, the proof of this result differs from that for the SCAD estimator.

Theorem 4.2 *Under the assumptions (A1)-(A4), with the tuning sequence* $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)})$ *as in Theorem 4.1, we have:*
(i) $(\hat{l}^L_r - \hat{l}^L_{r-1})^{1/2}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1};\hat{l}^L_r)} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0_r\right)_{\mathcal{A}^L_r} = (l^0_r - l^0_{r-1})^{1/2}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1};\hat{l}^L_r)} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0_r\right)_{\mathcal{A}^L_r}(1 + o_{I\!\!P}(1)) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}, 1/(4f^2(0))(\Omega^0_r)^{-1}\right)$.
(ii) $\lim_{n\to\infty} I\!\!P\left[\mathcal{A}^L_{n;(l^0_{r-1},l^0_r)} = \mathcal{A}^L_{n;(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r)} = \mathcal{A}^L_{(l^0_{r-1},l^0_r)}\right] = 1$, *with:* $\mathcal{A}^L_{(l^0_{r-1},l^0_r)} \equiv \left\{j; \phi^0_{r,j} \neq 0\right\}$, $\mathcal{A}^L_{n;(l^0_{r-1},l^0_r)} \equiv \left\{j; \hat{\phi}^L_{(l^0_{r-1},l^0_r),j} \neq 0\right\}$ *and* $\mathcal{A}^L_{n;(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r)} \equiv \left\{j; \hat{\phi}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r),j} \neq 0\right\} =^{noted} \mathcal{A}^L_r$.

It is worthwhile to mention that, if the same model (6) is estimated by least squares, under certain conditions on design $(\mathbf{X}_i)$, with a LASSO penalty, the sparsity property (i.e. the claim (ii) of the Theorem 4.2), is not satisfied. Moreover, as the model contains change-points, this condition is more difficult to check on each interval that has random bounds. Then, an adaptive LASSO method can be considered downside to remedy this. But, it is necessary that in each segment (l_{r-1}, l_r) parameter number is smaller than observation number $l_{r-1} - l_r$. On the other hand, the adaptive LASSO for least squares method holds only under the assumptions that the errors have mean zero and bounded variance.

Finally, we give the asymptotic distribution of the change-point estimator.

Theorem 4.3 *If* $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)}\|_2 = o_{I\!\!P}((l_r - l_{r-1})^{1/2})$, *under the assumptions (A1)-(A4), we have* $(\hat{l}^L_r - l^0_r) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \arg\min_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} Z^{(1/2)}_{r,j}$, *with* $Z^{(1/2)}_{r,j} = 0$ *the same process as in Theorem 3.3, for* $\tau = 1/2$.

Remark 3 *It is interesting to note that the asymptotic distributions of the LASSO-type change-point and parameter regression estimators are the same as for the SCAD estimators, even if the penalty has changed.*

Remark 4 *By LASSO-type method proposed in this Section, we have simultaneously the oracle properties and the asymptotic distribution for the change-point estimators, when* $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)}\|_2 = o_{I\!P}((l_r - l_{r-1})^{1/2})$. *Recall that for the general quantile regression, by SCAD method, we have either one or the other.*

An example of tuning random sequence $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)}$: in each segment (l_{r-1}, l_r) the LAD estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(1/2)}_{(l_{r-1},l_r)}$ of $\boldsymbol{\phi}_r$ is calculated by a corresponding relation to (3), for $\tau = 1/2$. Obtained estimators have all nonzero components and they have a convergence rate $v_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)}$ to the true parameter, with $(l_r - l_{r-1})v_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)} \rightarrow \infty$ (see Theorem 1 of Ciuperca, 2011b). Consider then $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)} = \left(\frac{1}{|\hat{\phi}^{(1/2)}_{(l_{r-1},l_r),1}|}, \cdots, \frac{1}{|\hat{\phi}^{(1/2)}_{(l_{r-1},l_r),p}|} \right)$.

5 Simulation study

We now give some simulation results. All simulations were performed using the R language. To calculate Least squares estimation the function *lm* was used. While, for the estimations quantile, SCAD and LASSO-type, the function *rq* of the package *quantreq* were called. To compare these estimates when the classical conditions on the error distribution do not occur, we consider also the adaptive LASSO estimation using the function *lqa* of the package *lqa* and quantile estimation with LASSO penalty.

The number of phases is assumed to be known: the models contain two change-points (three phases). We consider 10 latent variables $X_1, \cdots, X_{10}$ with $X_3 \sim \mathcal{N}(2,1)$, $X_4 \sim \mathcal{N}(4,1)$, $X_5 \sim \mathcal{N}(1,1)$ and $X_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ for $j \in \{1,2,6,7,8,9,10\}$. The true values of the regression parameters (coefficients) on the three segments are respectively: $(1,0,4,0,-3,5,6,0,-1,0)$, $(0,3,-4,-3,0,1,2,-3,0,10)$, $(1,3,4,0,0,1,0,0,0,1)$. Three error patterns were considered: exponential, Cauchy and standard normal distributions. The tuning parameter $\lambda_{n;(l_{r-1},l_r)}$ is $\log(l_r - l_{r-1}) \cdot \mathbf{1}_p$ for the quantile estimation with LASSO penalty, $(l_r - l_{r-1})^{3/2}$ for SCAD and LASSO-type estimations. For adaptive LASSO method, the adaptive penalty is $|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{LS}_{(l_{r-1},l_r)}|^{-9/40}$. For each model, we generated 500 Monte-Carlo random samples of size n, with $n = 60$ or $n = 200$. The percentage of zero coefficients incorrectly estimated to zero(true 0) and the percentage of nonzero coefficients estimated to zero(false 0) are computed (see Tables 1-6) by least squares(LS), quantile(QUANT), quantile with LASSO penalty(QLASSO), SCAD and LASSO-type methods. Since the asymptotic distribution of the change-points estimators can not be symmetric, in each table we also give the median of the change-point estimations. Because the results by the SCAD method are more poor than by the LASSO-type method, and also because there may be convergence problem (the function *rq* not responding), in Tables 4-6 the SCAD estimator is no considered.

The outliers of the errors do not affect the precision of the change-point estimations, by six methods, while the sparsity property of the QLASSO and adaptive LASSO are affected. The LASSO-type method provides very satisfactory estimations in any case even for small sample size. The only less favorable result is obtained for $n = 60$ when the errors are exponential. The percentage of false zero is large enough.

6 Proofs of Theorems and Propositions

In order to simplify the proofs of theorems and propositions, we give in this section their demonstrations and in Section 6 some lemmas and their proofs which will useful.

Proof of Proposition 2.1
Let us consider the notations $h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}^0 - \boldsymbol{\phi})$ and $F(x)$ for the distribution function of ε_i. By definition $\mathbb{E}[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] = \int_{\mathbb{R}}[\rho_\tau(x + h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})) - \rho_\tau(x)]dF(x)$. Using $F(0) = \tau$, a simple algebraic computation gives

$$\mathbb{E}[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] = \int_0^{-h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})} [|h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})| - x]dF(x), \qquad \text{if } h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi}) < 0. \tag{13}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] = \int_{-h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})}^0 [|h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})| + x]dF(x), \qquad \text{if } h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \geq 0. \tag{14}$$

Taking into account the relations (13) and (14) we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] &\geq \mathbb{1}_{h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})\geq 0} \int_{-\frac{h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})}{2}}^0 [|h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})| + x]dF(x) + \mathbb{1}_{h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})<0} \int_0^{-\frac{h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})}{2}} [|h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})| - x]dF(x) \\
&\geq \mathbb{1}_{h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})\geq 0} \frac{|h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})|}{2} \int_{-\frac{h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})}{2}}^0 dF(x) + \mathbb{1}_{h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})<0} \frac{|h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})|}{2} \int_0^{-\frac{h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})}{2}} dF(x) \\
&= \frac{|h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})|}{2} \left[\mathbb{1}_{h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})\geq 0}[F(0) - F(-\frac{h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})}{2})] + \mathbb{1}_{h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})<0}[F(-\frac{h_i(\boldsymbol{\phi})}{2}) - F(0)] \right] \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\mathbb{E}[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] \geq 0$, for all $i = 1, \cdots, n$, $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \Gamma$. ◊

6.1 For SCAD estimator

Proof of Proposition 3.1
If $j \in \mathcal{A}_n$. According to the definition (7), the SCAD estimator of $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is the solution of the following equation $0 = \frac{\partial G_i^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^{(\tau,\lambda)})}{\partial \phi_{,j}}$

$$= -\tau X_{ij} + X_{ij} \mathbb{1}_{Y_i < \mathbf{X}_i^t \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}} + \lambda \left\{ \mathbb{1}_{|\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}| \leq \lambda} \cdot sgn(\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}) + \frac{(a\lambda - |\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}|)_+}{(a-1)\lambda} sgn(\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}) \mathbb{1}_{|\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}| > \lambda} \right\}.$$

Adding these, we obtain

$$\tau \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} 1\!\!1_{Y_i < \mathbf{X}_i^t \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}} = n\lambda \cdot sgn(\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}) \left\{ 1\!\!1_{|\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}| \leq \lambda} + \frac{(a\lambda - |\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}|)_+}{(a-1)\lambda} 1\!\!1_{|\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}| > \lambda} \right\}.$$

If $j \notin \mathcal{A}_n$. In this case $0 \in \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial G_{i,n}^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)})}{\partial \phi_{,j}} = -\tau \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} 1\!\!1_{Y_i < \mathbf{X}_i^t \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}} + \sum_{i=1}^n p'_\lambda(|\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)}|)$. Since $p'_\lambda(|\phi_{,j}|) \equiv \frac{\partial p_\lambda(|\phi_{,j}|)}{\partial \phi_{,j}} = \lambda \cdot sgn(\phi_{,j}) 1\!\!1_{|\phi_{,j}| \leq \lambda} + \frac{(a\lambda - |\phi_{,j}|)_+ \cdot sgn(\phi_{,j})}{a-1} 1\!\!1_{|\phi_{,j}| > \lambda}$, it follows that $0 \in \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial G_{i,n}^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\hat{\phi}_{n,j}^{(\tau,\lambda)})}{\partial \phi_{,j}} = -\tau \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} 1\!\!1_{Y_i < \mathbf{X}_i^t \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}} + n\lambda \cdot [-1, 1]$. Then, $|\tau \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} 1\!\!1_{Y_i < \mathbf{X}_i^t \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}}| \leq n\lambda$. ♢

Proof of Theorem 3.1
The proof is similar to that of Theorem 4.1. It is omitted. The Lemmas 7.2 and 7.5 stated in Section 6 are needed. ♢

Proof of Theorem 3.2
(i) The statement results from Theorem 3.1 together with Theorem 2(b) of Wu and Liu (2009).
(ii) By the Theorem 2(a) of Wu and Liu(2009), we have: $\lim_{n \to \infty} I\!\!P \left[\mathcal{A}_{n;(l_{r-1}^0, l_r^0)} = \mathcal{A}_{(l_{r-1}^0, l_r^0)} \right] = 1$. The asymptotic normality of the estimators implies: for all $k \in \mathcal{A}_{n;(\hat{l}_{r-1}^{(\tau,\lambda)}, \hat{l}_r^{(\tau,\lambda)})}$, we have $\phi_{r,k}^0 - \hat{\phi}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(\hat{l}_{r-1}^{(\tau,\lambda)}, \hat{l}_r^{(\tau,\lambda)}),k} \underset{n \to \infty}{\xrightarrow{I\!\!P}} 0$. It follows that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} I\!\!P \left[\mathcal{A}_{n;(\hat{l}_{r-1}^{(\tau,\lambda)}, \hat{l}_r^{(\tau,\lambda)})} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{(l_{r-1}^0, l_r^0)} \right] = 1 \tag{15}$$

By similar arguments that for the Lemma 1 of Wu and Liu(2009), we prove that

$$I\!\!P \left[\exists k \in \{1, \cdots, p\}, k \notin \mathcal{A}_{(l_{r-1}^0, l_r^0)}, k \in \mathcal{A}_{n;(\hat{l}_{r-1}^{(\tau,\lambda)}, \hat{l}_r^{(\tau,\lambda)})} \right] \underset{n \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} 0. \tag{16}$$

The Theorem results from the relations (15) and (16). ♢

Proof of Theorem 3.3
Consider the case $j > 0$, the case $j < 0$ is similar. Then $Z_{r,j}^{(\tau)} = \sum_{i=l_r^0+1}^{l_r^0+j} G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{r-1}^0, \boldsymbol{\phi}_r^0)$. Using the Proposition 2.1, we have: $I\!\!E[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{r-1}^0, \boldsymbol{\phi}_r^0)] > 0$. Then, $I\!\!E[Z_{r,j}^{(\tau)}] = jI\!\!E[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_{r-1}^0, \boldsymbol{\phi}_r^0)] \to \infty$, for $n \to \infty$. Thus, for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $M_{1,\epsilon} > 0$ such that: $I\!\!E[\arg\min_j Z_{r,j}^{(\tau)} \leq M_{1,\epsilon}] \geq 1 - \epsilon$. By Theorem 3.1, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $M_{2,\epsilon} > 0$ such that for each $r = 1, \cdots, K$: $I\!\!P[|\hat{l}_r^{(\tau,\lambda)} - l_r^0| \leq M_{2,\epsilon}] \geq 1 - \epsilon$. Consider then $M_\epsilon = \max\{M_{1,\epsilon}, M_{2,\epsilon}\}$. For each $|i_r| \leq M_\epsilon$, let us

consider the difference $S(l_1^0+i_1, \cdots, l_K^0+i_K) - S(l_1^0, \cdots, l_K^0)$, rewritten as

$$\sum_{r=1}^{K} \sum_{i=l^0_{r-1}+i_{r-1}}^{l_r^0} \Big\{ \rho_\tau(Y_j - \mathbf{X}_j^t \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(l^0_{r-1}+i_{r-1},l^0_r+i_r)}) - \rho_\tau(Y_j - \mathbf{X}_j^t \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(l^0_{r-1},l^0_r)}) \Big\}$$

$$+ i_r \Big[\mathbf{p}_{\lambda;(l^0_{r-1}+i_{r-1},l^0_r+i_r)}(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(l^0_{r-1}+i_{r-1},l^0_r+i_r)}|) - \mathbf{p}_{\lambda;(l^0_{r-1},l^0_t)}(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(l^0_{r-1},l^0_r)}|) \Big]$$

$$+ \sum_{r=1}^{K} \sum_{i=l_r^0+1}^{l_r^0+i_r} \Big\{ \Big[\rho_\tau(Y_j - \mathbf{X}_j^t \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(l^0_{r-1}+i_{r-1},l^0_r+i_r)}) - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_j) \Big] - \Big[\rho_\tau(Y_j - \mathbf{X}_j^t \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(l^0_r,l^0_{r+1})}) - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_j) \Big] \Big\}$$

$$+ (l_r^0 - l_{r-1}^0 + i_r - i_{r-1}) \Big[\mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(l^0_{r-1}+i_{r-1},l^0_r+i_r)}|) - \mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{(l^0_r,l^0_{r+1})}|) \Big] \mathbf{1}_p \equiv D_1 + P_1 + D_2 - D_3 + P_2.$$

Recall that the definition of the function S is given by the relation (9). For studying $P2$, consider definition (8) of the $p'_\lambda = \lambda 1\!\!1_{|\hat{\phi}_{,j}|<\lambda} + \frac{a\lambda - |\hat{\phi}_{,j}|}{a-1} 1\!\!1_{\lambda \geq |\hat{\phi}_{,j}| < a\lambda} \leq C\lambda$. Under condition $\lambda_{(l^0_{r-1},l^0_r)}(l^0_r - l^0_{r-1})^{1/2} = o(1)$ together the Theorem 3.1 we obtain that $D_1, P_1, D_3, P_2 = o_{I\!\!P}(1)$. For D_2, since $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau;\lambda)}_{(l^0_{r-1}+i_{r-1},l^0_r+i_r)} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0_r = O_{I\!\!P}(l^0_r - l^0_{r-1})^{-1/2}$, together the assumption (A3), imply the conclusion. $\Diamond$

6.2 For LASSO-type estimator

Proof of Theorem 4.1
Obviously, we have

$$0 \geq \sum_{j=1}^{J(t)+1} \min_{\boldsymbol{\phi}_j \in \Gamma} \left[\sum_{i=k_{j-1,t}+1}^{k_{j,t}} |\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_j - \boldsymbol{\phi}_t^0)| + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{n;(k_{j-1,t};k_{j,t})} \cdot |\boldsymbol{\phi}_j| \right]$$

$$- \sum_{j=1}^{J(t)+1} \left[|\sum_{i=k_{j-1,t}+1}^{k_{j,t}} \varepsilon_i| + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{n;(k_{j-1,t};k_{j,t})} |\boldsymbol{\phi}_j^0| \right] \geq -2(K+1) \sup_{1 \leq l < j \leq n} \left| \inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \left[\sum_{i=l+1}^{j} \eta^L_{i;(l,j)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \right] \right|$$

which is, using the Lemma 7.6, $-O_{I\!\!P}(\max(n^\alpha, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_n))$, with $\alpha \in (1/2, 1)$. The rest of proof is similar to that in Ciuperca(2013), Theorem 1, using also the Lemma 7.8 stated in Section 7. The details are omitted. $\Diamond$

Proof of Theorem 4.3
The proof is similar to those of Theorem 2 of Ciuperca(2013). For the without penalty member we apply together the Theorem 4.1 (for the rate of convergence) and the Theorem 4 of Bai(1998). The penalty member, is of order $o_{I\!\!P}(1)$ by assumption $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{n,(l_{r-1},l_r)}\|_2 = o_{I\!\!P}((l_r - l_{r-1})^{1/2})$ and

$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r)} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0_r\|_2 = (l^0_r - l^0_{r-1})^{-1/2} O_{I\!\!P}(1).$ ◊

Proof of Theorem 4.2
(i) The assertion follows from the Theorem 4.1 and from the Theorem 3(b) in Xu and Ying (2010). *(ii)* By Xu and Ying (2010), we have: $\lim_{n\to\infty} I\!\!P\left[\mathcal{A}^L_{n;(l^0_{r-1},l^0_r)} = \mathcal{A}^L_{(l^0_{r-1},l^0_r)}\right] = 1$. The asymptotic normality of the estimators implies that, for all $k \in \mathcal{A}^L_{n;(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r)}$ we have $\phi^0_{r,k} - \hat{\phi}^L_{n;(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r),k} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{I\!\!P} 0$. Thus $\lim_{n\to\infty} I\!\!P\left[\mathcal{A}^L_{n;(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r)} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^L_{(l^0_{r-1},l^0_r)}\right] = 1$. The proof is finished if we show the claim $I\!\!P\left[\exists k \in \{1,\cdots,p\}, k \notin \mathcal{A}^L_{(l^0_{r-1},l^0_r)}, k \in \mathcal{A}^L_{n;(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r)}\right] \longrightarrow 0$, for $n \to \infty$. Since $k \in \mathcal{A}^L_{n;(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r)}$ we have that, with the probability 1,

$$sgn(\hat{\phi}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r),k}) \neq 0. \tag{17}$$

We suppose, without loss of generality, that $sgn(\hat{\phi}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r),k}) = 1$. Then, using the KKT conditions, we have with the probability 1,

$$\lambda_{n,(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r),k} \cdot sgn(\hat{\phi}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1},\hat{l}^L_r),k}) = \sum_{i=\hat{l}^L_{r-1}+1}^{\hat{l}^L_r} X_{ik} \cdot sgn(Y_i - \mathbf{X}^t_i \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1};\hat{l}^L_r)}). \tag{18}$$

On the other hand, since $k \notin \mathcal{A}^L_{(l^0_{r-1},l^0_r)}$, we have $\phi^0_{r,k} = 0$, then $sgn(\phi^0_{r,k}) = 0$. By the proof of the Proposition 4 in the paper of Xu and Ying(2010), for $\phi^0_{,k} = 0$, we have that for every $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ such that $\|\phi_{,k}\| \leq Cn^{-1/2}$,

$$I\!\!P\left[sgn\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n X_{ik} \cdot sgn(Y_i - \mathbf{X}^t_i \boldsymbol{\phi}) + \lambda_{n,k} \cdot sgn(\phi_{,k})\right) = sgn(\phi_{,k})\right] \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 1.$$

Then, taking into account the assertion (i), we apply the previous relation for $\hat{\phi}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1};\hat{l}^L_r),k}$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} I\!\!P\left[sgn\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n X_{ik} \cdot sgn(Y_i - \mathbf{X}^t_i \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1};\hat{l}^L_r)}) + \lambda_{n,(\hat{l}^L_{r-1};\hat{l}^L_r),k} \cdot sgn(\hat{\phi}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1};\hat{l}^L_r),k}\right) = sgn(\phi_{,k})\right] = 1,$$

where $\hat{\phi}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1};\hat{l}^L_r),k}$ is the kth component of the random vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1};\hat{l}^L_r)}$. Moreover, by (18), $sgn\left(-\sum_{i=1}^n X_{ik} \cdot sgn(Y_i - \mathbf{X}^t_i \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1};\hat{l}^L_r)}) + \lambda_{n,(\hat{l}^L_{r-1};\hat{l}^L_r),k} \cdot sgn(\hat{\phi}^L_{(\hat{l}^L_{r-1};\hat{l}^L_r),k})\right)$ is 0, with the probability 1. Then $\lim_{n\to\infty} I\!\!P\left[0 = sgn(\phi_{,k})\right] = 1$. Contradiction with (17). Thus the claim holds. ◊

The demonstration of the Remark 1 is similar to that of Bai(1998). Then we give only the main idea.

Proof of Remark 1
Similar as for the proof of the Lemma 7.1, we obtain, for $\|\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2\|_2 \leq c_n n^{-1/2}$,

$$\frac{1}{nc_n^2} \left| \left(\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - \mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!\!E[\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] + I\!\!E[\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] \right) \right| \leq C \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2\|_2}{c_n^2} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n} c_n},$$

which converges to 0 for $n \to \infty$. We also have $I\!\!P[\sup_j |n^{-1} c_n^{-2} [\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_j; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!\!E[\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_j; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)]]| > \epsilon] \leq \sum_j I\!\!P[|[\mathcal{G}_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_j; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!\!E[\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_j; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)]]| > nc_n^2 \epsilon]$, where $j = 1, \cdots, n^{p/2}$. By the relations (20) and (21), we have $|G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!\!E[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)]| \leq C|\mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)| < Cc_n$. The rest of proof is similar to that of the Lemma 4 of Bai(1998). $\Diamond$

7 Lemmas

We present in this section the lemmas with proofs, which are useful to prove the main results. Following Lemma gives the asymptotic behavior of the objective function $G_i^{(\tau)}$ without penalty. In fact, Lemma 7.1 will be necessary to prove the Lemmas 7.2 and 7.6, where the penalized objective functions are studied.

Lemma 7.1 *Under the assumptions (A1), (A3), for all* $\alpha > 1/2$, *we have* $\sup_{1 \leq l < k \leq n} | \inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \Gamma} \sum_{i=l}^k G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)| = O_{I\!\!P}(n^\alpha)$.

Proof of Lemma 7.1
By direct calculations $R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)$ can be written as

$$\left\{ \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2)[(1-\tau)1\!\!1_{\varepsilon_i \leq 0} - \tau 1\!\!1_{\varepsilon_i > 0}]) \right\} + \left\{ [\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)][\tau 1\!\!1_{\varepsilon_i > \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)} - (1 - \tau 1\!\!1_{\varepsilon_i \leq \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)})] \right\}$$

$$- \left\{ [\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)][\tau 1\!\!1_{\varepsilon_i > \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)} - (1 - \tau 1\!\!1_{\varepsilon_i \leq \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)})] \right\} \equiv S_{1,i} + S_{2,i} - S_{3,i}. \qquad (19)$$

Obviously $S_{1,i} = \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2) D_i$. For $S_{2,i} - S_{3,i}$ we have:
- If $\varepsilon_i > \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)$. When $\varepsilon_i > \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)$, we have $S_{2,i} - S_{3,i} = \tau \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_1)$. In the case $\varepsilon_i \leq \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)$, we have $S_{2,i} - S_{3,i} = \tau \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_1) + [\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] \leq \tau \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_1)$. Then, in the both cases, $S_{2,i} - S_{3,i} \leq \tau \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_1)$.
- If $\varepsilon_i \leq \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)$. When $\varepsilon_i \leq \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)$, we have $S_{2,i} - S_{3,i} = (1-\tau)\mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2)$. In the case $\varepsilon_i > \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)$, we have $S_{2,i} - S_{3,i} = (1-\tau)[\mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2) + \varepsilon_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] \leq (1-\tau)\mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2)$. Then, in the both cases, $S_{2,i} - S_{3,i} \leq (1-\tau)\mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2)$.

In conclusion, with the probability 1,

$$S_{1,i} + S_{2,i} - S_{3,i} \leq \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2) D_i + \max(\tau \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_1), (1-\tau)\mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2)) \qquad (20)$$

Similarly

$$S_{1,i} + S_{2,i} - S_{3,i} \geq \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2)D_i + \min(\tau \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_1), (1-\tau)\mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2)) \tag{21}$$

Hence, the relations (19), (20) and (21), for $\|\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2\|_2 \leq Cn^{-1/2}$ together the assumption (A3), imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\sum_{i=1}^n \left[R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!E[R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] + I\!E[R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)]\right]\right| \\ &\qquad \leq C \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{X}_i\|_2 \cdot \|\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_1\|_2 \leq O_{I\!P}(n^{1/2}). \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

By an argument similar to the one used in Bai(1998), Lemma 3, we obtain

$$\sup_{1 \leq l < k \leq n} \left| \inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \sum_{i=l}^k G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \right| \leq 2 \sup_{1 \leq k \leq n} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k [G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!E[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)]] \right|.$$

On the other hand

$$\sum_{i=1}^k [G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!E[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)]] = \sum_{i=1}^k [R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!E[R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)]] + \sum_{i=1}^k D_i \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0).$$

Let us consider the random process $\xi_k = \sup_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \left|\sum_{i=1}^k [G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!E[G_i^{(\tau; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)]]\right|$. Then, since by Proposition 2.1 $I\!E[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] \geq 0$, follows that $\{\xi_k, \mathcal{F}_k\}_{k=1,\cdots,n}$ is a sub-martingale, where $\mathcal{F}_k = \sigma - field\{\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_k\}$, which implies, using Doob's inequality $I\!P[\sup_{1 \leq k \leq n} \xi_k > n^\alpha] \leq n^{-\alpha m} C_m I\!E[\xi_n^m], \qquad C_m > 0$, with $m > 1$. We divide the parameter set Γ into $m^{p/2}$ cells, such that the cell diameter is $\leq n^{-1/2}$. Thus

$$\left|\sum_{i=1}^n \left[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!E[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] - G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) + I\!E[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)]\right]\right|$$

$$\leq \left|\sum_{i=1}^n \left[R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!E[R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)] - R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) + I\!E[R_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2, \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)]\right]\right| + \left|\sum_{i=1}^n D_i \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2)\right|$$

and using the relation (22), we obtain, with the probability 1, that the last relation is smaller than $\sum_{i=1}^n |\mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_1)| \leq Cnn^{-1/2} = Cn^{1/2}$. By an argument similar to the one used in Bai(1998), we have $I\!E\left|\sum_{i=1}^n [G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_r; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - I\!E[G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_r; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)]]\right| \leq Cn^{m/2}$. The rest of proof is similar to that of the Lemma 3 of Bai(1998). $\Diamond$

7.1 For SCAD estimator

Following result will be useful in the study of the convergence rate of the change-point SCAD estimator in a model with breaking.

Lemma 7.2 *Under the assumptions (A1), (A3), for a positive sequence* $(\lambda_n)_n$ *such that* $\lambda_n \to 0$, *we have*

$$\sup_{0 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n} \left| \inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \sum_{i=j_1+1}^{j_2} G_i^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \right| = O_{I\!P}(n^\alpha, n\lambda_n).$$

Proof of Lemma 7.2
Using the triangle inequality, we deduce that

$$\sup_{0 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n} \left| \inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \sum_{i=j_1+1}^{j_2} G_i^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \right| \leq \sup_{0 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n} \left| \inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \sum_{i=j_1+1}^{j_2} G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \right| + n \sup_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \left| (\mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}|) - \mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}^0|))^t \mathbf{1}_p \right|.$$

Considering Lemma 7.1 and the definition of p'_λ, we have that the last relation is smaller than $O_{I\!P}(n^\alpha) + n\lambda_n$. ♢

In the following Lemma, the behavior of $\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}$ is studied in the outside of the ball center $\boldsymbol{\beta}^0$ and radius c_n.

Lemma 7.3 *Under the assumptions (A1), (A2), with* (c_n) *a positive sequence such that* $c_n \to 0$ *and* $nc_n/\log n \to \infty$, *there exists* $\epsilon > 0$ *such that*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \left(\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{\phi}-\boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \geq c_n} \frac{1}{nc_n^2} \mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \right) \geq \epsilon > 0.$$

Proof of Lemma 7.3
Let $\mathbf{u}$ in an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^p$. By the proof of the Lemma 3 of Wu and Liu(2009), taking into account the assumptions (A1) and (A2), we have

$$I\!E\left[\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)} \left(\boldsymbol{\phi}^0 + \frac{\mathbf{u}}{\sqrt{n}}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0 \right) \right] = \frac{f(0)}{2n} \mathbf{u}^t (\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^t) \mathbf{u} + o_{I\!P}(1).$$

If $c_n \to 0$ and $nc_n^2 \to \infty$, we have similarly $I\!E\left[\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)} \left(\boldsymbol{\phi}^0 + \mathbf{u}c_n; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0 \right) \right] = \frac{f(0)}{2} c_n^2 \mathbf{u}^t (\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{X}_i \mathbf{X}_i^t) \mathbf{u} + o_{I\!P}(1)$. The function $G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)$ is convex, hence $\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)$ is convex in $\boldsymbol{\phi}$. Thus, its minimum over $\|\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \geq c_n$ is realized for $\|\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 = c_n$. Then, for $\|\mathbf{u}\|_2 = 1$, using the assumption (A2) we obtain that $I\!E\left[\mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)} \left(\boldsymbol{\phi}^0 + \mathbf{u}c_n; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0 \right) \right] = \frac{f(0)}{2} nc_n^2 (1 + o_{I\!P}(1))$. The rest of proof follows using the the Lemma 5 of Bai(1998). ♢

Lemma 7.4 *Under the assumptions (A1), (A2), for two positive sequences* (c_n) *and* (λ_n) *such that* $\lambda_n \to 0$, $c_n \to 0$, $nc_n/\log n \to \infty$ *and* $\lambda_n c_n^{-2} \to 0$, *we have*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \left(\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{\phi}-\boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \geq c_n} \frac{1}{nc_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n G_i^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \right) > \epsilon.$$

Proof of Lemma 7.4
Applying the mean value theorem, we write $G_i^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0) = G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0) + [|\boldsymbol{\phi}| - |\boldsymbol{\phi}^0|]^t \mathbf{p}'_\lambda(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\phi}})$, with $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\phi}} = \boldsymbol{\phi}^0 - \mathbf{b}(\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)$, $\mathbf{b} \in [0,1]^p$. Then, using the relation (8), we have

$$\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{\phi}-\boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \geq c_n} \frac{1}{nc_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n G_i^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \geq \inf_{\|\boldsymbol{\phi}-\boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \geq c_n} \frac{1}{nc_n^2} \mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - \frac{n\lambda_n}{nc_n^2}.$$

Since $\lambda_n c_n^{-2} \to 0$, for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a $n_\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\lambda_n c_n^{-2} < \epsilon/2$. An application of Lemma 7.3 leads to $\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{\phi}-\boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \geq c_n} \frac{1}{nc_n^2} \mathcal{G}_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}^0) > \frac{3\epsilon}{2}$ and Lemma is proved. $\Diamond$

By similar calculus as in Bai(1998), Lemma 10, we have following result for the estimator (3) of $\boldsymbol{\phi}$.

Lemma 7.5 *For* (λ_n), (c_n) *as in the Lemma 7.4), under assumptions (A1)-(A3), for all* $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $n_1 \geq n^u$, *with* $3/4 \leq u \leq 1$, $n_2 \leq n^v$, $v < 1/4$, *let us consider the model*

$$\begin{array}{ll} Y_i = \mathbf{X}_i^t \boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0 + \varepsilon_i, & i = 1, \cdots, n_1 \\ Y_i = \mathbf{X}_i^t \boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0 + \varepsilon_i, & i = n_1+1, \cdots, n_1+n_2 \end{array}$$

with the assumption $\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0 \neq \boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0$. *Consider* $A_{n_1+n_2}^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} G_i^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0) + \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} G_i^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0)$ *and* $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{n_1+n_2}^{(\tau,\lambda)} \equiv \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} A_{n_1+n_2}^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$.
(i) $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{n_1+n_2}^{(\tau,\lambda)} - \boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0\|_2 \leq n_1^{-1/2} n_1^{\frac{v+\delta}{2u}} \leq n^{-(u-v-\delta)/2}$.
(ii) $\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} G_i^{(\tau,\lambda)}\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{n_1+n_2}^{(\tau,\lambda)};\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0\right) = O_{I\!P}(1)$.

Proof of Lemma 7.5
(i) $A_{n_1+n_2}^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{n_1+n_2}^{\tau,\lambda}) \leq \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} G_i^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0;\boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0) = \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0;\boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0) + n_2[\mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0|) - \mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0|)]\mathbf{1}_p = o_{I\!P}(1) + O(n_2)$. By Lemma 7.4, for $G_i^{(\tau,\lambda)}$, $i = n_1+1, \cdots, n_2$, we arrive to a contradiction.
(ii) Let $Z_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} G_i^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi};\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0)$, $t_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \equiv \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \left[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0)) - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0))\right]$, $t_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \equiv t_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + n_2[\mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}|) - \mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0|)]\mathbf{1}_p$, $Z_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \equiv Z_n^{(\tau)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + n_1[\mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}|) - \mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0|)]\mathbf{1}_p$. Then

$$A_{n_1+n_2}^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = Z_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + t_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + n_2[\mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0|) - \mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0|)]\mathbf{1}_p + \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \left[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i - \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0)) - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i)\right].$$

We have $|t_n^{(\tau,\lambda)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{n_1+n_2})| \leq |t_n^{(\tau)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{n_1+n_2})| + n_2 \|\mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{n_1+n_2}|) - \mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0|)\|_1$ and similarly that for the relation (20) $\leq C \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} |\mathbf{X}_i|_1 \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{n_1+n_2} - \boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0\|_2 + n_2 \|\mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^{(\tau,\lambda)}_{n_1+n_2}|) - \mathbf{p}_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0|)\|_1$. The rest of proof is similar to that of the Lemma 3(ii) of Ciuperca(2013), taking into account the assumption (A3). $\Diamond$

We have the equivalent of Lemma 4 of the same paper.

7.2 For LASSO-type estimator

Lemma 7.6 *Under the assumptions (A1), (A3), we have, for* $\alpha > 1/2$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n} \left| \inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \sum_{i=j_1+1}^{j_2} \eta^L_{i;(j_1,j_2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \right| = O_{I\!P}(\max(n^\alpha, \sup_{0 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n} \|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{n;(j_1,j_2)}\|_2)).$$

Proof of Lemma 7.6
By the Lemma 3 of Bai(1998), Lemma holds for $G_i^{(1/2)}$ instead of $\eta^L_{i;(j_1,j_2)}$. For η^L_i, we have $|\eta^L_{i;(j_1,j_2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - G_i^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0)| = (j_1 - j_1)^{-1/2} |\boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{n;(j_1,j_2)}(|\boldsymbol{\phi}| - |\boldsymbol{\phi}^0|)|$. Then, by triangular inequality together the Lemma 7.1 and the compactness of the set Γ

$$\sup_{0 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n} \left| \inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \sum_{i=j_1+1}^{j_2} \eta^L_{i;(j_1,j_2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \right| \leq \sup_{0 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n} \left| \inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \sum_{i=j_1+1}^{j_2} G_i^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \right| + C \sup_{0 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n} \|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{n;(j_1,j_2)}\|_1$$

$$= O_{I\!P}(n^\alpha) + O_{I\!P}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n). \qquad \Diamond$$

Lemma 7.7 *Under the assumptions (A1), (A2), if* $n^{-1/2}\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n\|_2 \xrightarrow[n \to \infty]{I\!P} \lambda_0$, *with* $\lambda_0 \geq 0$, *then*

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \left(\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \geq n^{-1/2}} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta^L_{i;(0,n)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \right) > \epsilon.$$

Proof of Lemma 7.7
Using (A2), by the Lemma 6 of Ciuperca(2011b), we have for $G_i^{(1/2)}$, with the probability 1

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \left(\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \geq n^{-1/2}} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n G_i^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \right) > \frac{3\epsilon}{2}. \tag{23}$$

We also have the inequality

$$\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \geq n^{-1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta^L_{i;(0,n)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) \geq \inf_{\|\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \geq n^{-1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n G_i^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}^0) - \sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\phi} - \boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \geq n^{-1/2}} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_n(|\boldsymbol{\phi}| - |\boldsymbol{\phi}^0|).$$

$$\tag{24}$$

Since $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n\|_2 = O_{I\!P}(n^{-1/2})$ and $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ belongs to a compact set, then the last term of the right-hand-side of (24) is $o_{I\!P}(n^{-1})$. Hence

$$\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\phi}-\boldsymbol{\phi}^0\|_2 \geq n^{-1/2}} \left(n^{-1}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n^t(|\boldsymbol{\phi}| - |\boldsymbol{\phi}^0|)\right) < \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \qquad n \geq n_\epsilon. \tag{25}$$

The conclusion follows, combining the relations (23), (24) and (25). ◊

Lemma 7.8 *For all* $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that* $n_1 \geq n^u$, *with* $3/4 \leq u \leq 1$, $n_2 \leq n^v$, $v < 1/4$, *let us consider the model*

$$\begin{array}{ll} Y_i = \mathbf{X}_i^t\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0 + \varepsilon_i, & i = 1, \cdots, n_1 \\ Y_i = \mathbf{X}_i^t\boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0 + \varepsilon_i, & i = n_1+1, \cdots, n_1+n_2 \end{array}$$

with the assumption $\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0 \neq \boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0$. *Under the assumptions (A1)-(A3) and* (λ_n) *as in the Lemma 7.7, let us consider* $A^L_{n_1+n_2}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \eta^L_{i;(0,n_1)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0) + \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \eta^L_{i;(n_1,n_1+n_2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}; \boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0)$ *and* $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2} \equiv \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} A^L_{n_1+n_2}(\boldsymbol{\phi})$. *Then*
(i) $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2} - \boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0\|_2 \leq n_1^{-1/2} n_1^{\frac{v+\delta}{2u}} \leq n^{-(u-v-\delta)/2}$.
(ii) $\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \eta^L_{i;(0,n_1)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2}, \boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0) = O_{I\!P}(1)$.

Proof of Lemma 7.8
We denote $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{n_1+n_2} \equiv \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} G_i^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0) + \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} G_i^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0)$. Using the assumptions (A1) and (A3), by Lemma 10 of Bai(1998) we have that (i) and (ii) are true for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{n_1+n_2}$ and $G_i^{(1/2)}$.
(i) We suppose the contrary $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2} - \boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0\|_2 \geq n_1$. On the other hand, we have by definition:

$$A^L_{n_1+n_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2}) \leq \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \eta^L_{i;(n_1,n_1+n_2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0, \boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0) = \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} G_i^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0, \boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}_n^t(|\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0| - |\boldsymbol{\phi}^0|). \tag{26}$$

By Lemma 10(ii) of Bai(1998), we have: $\sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} G_i^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0, \boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0) = o_{I\!P}(1)$, then taking into account the relation (26), we obtain

$$A^L_{n_1+n_2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2}) \leq o_{I\!P}(1) + O_{I\!P}(n^{1/2}). \tag{27}$$

On the other hand, using the Lemma 7.7, we deduce

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \eta^L_{i;(0,n_1)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2}, \boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0) \geq O_{I\!P}(n_1). \tag{28}$$

There is a contradiction between the relations (27) and (28).
(ii) Introduce $\nu_{(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1,\boldsymbol{\phi}_2)}(\mathbf{X}_i) \equiv \mathbf{X}_i^t(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 - \boldsymbol{\phi}_2)$. For $\tau = 1/2$, let us recall the notations given in Lemma 7.5: $Z_n^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} G_i^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0)$, $t_n^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \equiv \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2}[|\varepsilon_i - \nu_{(\boldsymbol{\phi},\boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0)}(\mathbf{X}_i)| - |\varepsilon_i - \nu_{(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0,\boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0)}(\mathbf{X}_i)|]$. By the Lemma 7 of Ciuperca(2011b), we have that: $Z_n^{(1/2)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2}, \boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0) = O_{I\!P}(1)$. Introduce now $t_n^L(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \equiv t_n^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{(n_1,n_1+n_2)}[|\boldsymbol{\phi}| - |\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0|]$, $Z_n^L(\boldsymbol{\phi}) \equiv Z_n^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{(0,n_1)}[|\boldsymbol{\phi}| - |\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0|]$. Thus $A^L_{n_1+n_2}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = Z_n^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{(0,n_1)}[|\boldsymbol{\phi}| - |\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0|] + t_n^{(1/2)}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2}\Big[|\varepsilon_i - \nu_{(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0,\boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0)}(\mathbf{X}_i)| - |\varepsilon_i|\Big] + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{(n_1,n_1+n_2)}[|\boldsymbol{\phi}| - |\boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0|]$ $= Z_n^L(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + t_n^L(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{(n_1,n_1+n_2)}[|\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0| - |\boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0|] - \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2}\Big[|\varepsilon_i - \nu_{(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0,\boldsymbol{\phi}_2^0)}(\mathbf{X}_i)| - |\varepsilon_i|\Big]$. Then $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2} \equiv \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} A^L_{n_1+n_2}(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}[Z_n^L(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + t_n^L(\boldsymbol{\phi})]$. But $|t_n^L(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2})| \leq |t_n^{(1/2)}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2})| + |\boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{(n_1,n_1+n_2)}[|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2}| - |\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0|]|$ and using the elementary inequality $||a| - |b|| \leq |a - b|$, we have $|t_n^L(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2})| \leq \sum_{i=n_1+1}^{n_1+n_2} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2} - \boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0\|_1 \cdot \|\mathbf{X}_i^t\|_1 + |\boldsymbol{\lambda}^t_{(n_1,n_1+n_2)}[|\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2}| - |\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0|]| \leq o_{I\!P}(1)$, we have used (i) and the assumptions (A3) and $\|\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{(n_1,n_1+n_2)}\|_2 = o_{I\!P}(n_2^{1/2})$.
We have also $Z_n^L(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0) = t_n^L(\boldsymbol{\phi}_1^0)$. Thus $0 \geq \inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(Z_n^L(\boldsymbol{\phi}) + t_n^L(\boldsymbol{\phi})) = Z_n^L(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2}) + t_n^L(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2}) = Z_n^L(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}^L_{n_1+n_2}) - |o_{I\!P}(1)| \geq \inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} Z_n^L(\boldsymbol{\phi}) - |o_{I\!P}(1)|$. But $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} Z_n(\boldsymbol{\phi}) = O_{I\!P}(1)$. The rest of proof is similar to that of the Lemma 3(ii) of Ciuperca(2011a). ◊

References

[1] G.J. Babu, (1989), Strong representations for LAD estimators in linear models. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **83**, pp. 547-558.

[2] Bai, J.,(1998). Estimation of multiple-regime regressions with least absolute deviation. *Journal of Statistical Planning Inference*, **74**, 103-134.

[3] Ciuperca, G.,(2013). Model selection by LASSO methods in a change-point model, *Statistical Papers*, DOI 10.1007/s00362-012-0482-x.

[4] Ciuperca, G.,(2011a). Penalized least absolute deviations estimation for nonlinear model with change-points. *Statistical Papers*, **52**(2), 371-390.

[5] Ciuperca, G.,(2011b). Estimating nonlinear regression with and without change-points by the LAD-method. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **63**(4), 717-743.

[6] Fan, J. and Li, R.,(2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **96**(456), 1348-1360.

[7] Koenker, R.,(2005). *Quantile Regression*, Cambridge University Press.

[8] Xu, J. and Ying, Z.,(2010). Simultaneous estimation and variable selection in median regression using Lasso-type penalty. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **62**, 487-514.

[9] Wang L.,(2012). L_1 penalized LAD estimator for high dimensional linear regression. *arXiv:1202:6347*.

[10] Wu, Y. and Liu, Y.,(2009). Variable selection in quantile regression. *Statistica Sinica*, **19**, 801-817.

[11] Zou, H.,(2006). The adaptive Lasso and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **101**(476), 1418-1428.

Appendix

Table 1: Median of change-point estimations, percentage of true 0 and of false 0 by LS, QUANT, QLASSO, SCAD, LASSO-type and adaptive LASSO methods for $n = 200$, $K = 2$, $l_1^0 = 30$, $l_2^0 = 100$, $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{E}xp(-1.5)$.

Method	LS	QUANT	QLASSO	SCAD	LASSO-type	aLASSO
median of $(\hat{l}_1, \hat{l}_2)$	(31,100)	(31,100)	(31,100)	(30,100)	(30,100)	(30,100)
% of trues 0	0	0	46	75	97	94
% of false 0	0	0	1	3	3	8

Table 2: Median of change-point estimations, percentage of true 0 and of false 0 by LS, QUANT, QLASSO, SCAD, LASSO-type and adaptive LASSO methods for $n = 200$, $K = 2$, $l_1^0 = 30$, $l_2^0 = 100$, $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

Method	LS	QUANT	QLASSO	SCAD	LASSO-type	aLASSO
median of $(\hat{l}_1, \hat{l}_2)$	(31,100)	(30,100)	(30,100)	(30,100)	(30,100)	(30,100)
% of trues 0	0	0	37	65	98	94
% of false 0	0	0	0.5	5	2	8

Table 3: Median of change-point estimations, percentage of true 0 and of false 0 by LS, QUANT, QLASSO, SCAD, LASSO-type and adaptive LASSO methods for $n = 200$, $K = 2$, $l_1^0 = 30$, $l_2^0 = 100$, $\varepsilon_i \sim Cauchy$.

Method	LS	QUANT	QLASSO	SCAD	LASSO-type	aLASSO
median of $(\hat{l}_1, \hat{l}_2)$	(31,100)	(30.5,100)	(30,100)	(30,100)	(30,100)	(30,100)
% of trues 0	0	0	36	62	95	48
% of false 0	0	0	1	3	3	12

Table 4: Median of change-point estimations, percentage of true 0 and of false 0 by LS, QUANT, QLASSO, LASSO-type and adaptive LASSO methods for $n = 60$, $K = 2$, $l_1^0 = 17$, $l_2^0 = 40$, $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{E}xp(-1.5)$.

Method	LS	QUANT	QLASSO	LASSO-type	aLASSO
median of$(\hat{l}_1, \hat{l}_2)$	(18,40)	(18,40)	(18,40)	(18,40)	(17,40)
% of trues 0	0	0	60	91	75
% of false 0	0	0	27	27	17

Table 5: Median of change-point estimations, percentage of true 0 and of false 0 by LS, QUANT, QLASSO, LASSO-type and adaptive LASSO methods for $n = 60$, $K = 2$, $l_1^0 = 17$, $l_2^0 = 40$, $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

Method	LS	QUANT	QLASSO	LASSO-type	aLASSO
median of$(\hat{l}_1, \hat{l}_2)$	(18,40)	(18,40)	(18,40)	(17,40)	(17,40)
% of trues 0	0	0	51	92.5	82
% of false 0	0	0	7	13	15

Table 6: Median of change-point estimations, percentage of true 0 and of false 0 by LS, QUANT, QLASSO, LASSO-type and adaptive LASSO methods for $n = 60$, $K = 2$, $l_1^0 = 17$, $l_2^0 = 40$, $\varepsilon_i \sim Cauchy$.

Method	LS	QUANT	QLASSO	LASSO-type	aLASSO
median of$(\hat{l}_1, \hat{l}_2)$	(17,40)	(18,40)	(18,40)	(17,40)	(17,40)
% of trues 0	0	0	48.5	82	43
% of false 0	0	0	18	26	16